REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 -30 are pending and under consideration. Claim 8 has been amended. No new matter is included in this amendment.

Allowable Subject Matter:

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 2-7, 12-18 and 20-30 are allowed.

Also at page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 8-10 and 19 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form including the features of claim 1; thus, claims 9, 10 and 19, which depend from claim 8, are deemed to be in condition for allowance.

The 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection:

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,719,982 to Kawamura et al., further in view of U.S. Patent 6,771,671 to Fields et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 recites a combination comprising "a transmission interface unit which: compares a current graphic signal with a previous graphic signal to generate compressed transmission data based on the comparison, modulates the transmission data together with header information into an optical signal for transmission via a single channel, and transmits the optical signal; an optical transmission medium which communicates the transmitted optical signal; and a reception interface unit which regenerates a graphic signal based on the transmission data and header information contained in the optical signal and transmits the regenerated graphic signal to the display unit."

The invention as claimed must be viewed with regard to the problem which is intended to be solved, i.e., increasing a separation between a graphic signal generation unit and a display unit while avoiding such problems as excess electromagnetic radiation and signal loss due to shielding of electrical cables as in a conventional connection between a graphic signal display unit and a display unit.

The references which the Examiner asserts are combinable to teach the invention as claimed in claim 1 do not teach or suggest the combination of features as recited in the claim 1.

For Example, the Admitted Prior Art does not teach or suggest an interface unit which "compares a current graphic signal with a previous graphic signal to generate compressed transmission data based on the comparison," and "modulates the transmission data together with header information into an optical signal for transmission via a single channel."

Kawamura et al. disclose an apparatus for encoding compressed moving picture information and audio information onto a DSM 10 (FIG. 1) and decoding compressed moving picture information from the DSM 10 (FIG. 2). The apparatus of FIG. 1 takes in inputs and records data relating to the inputs on the DSM 10. The apparatus of FIG. 2 reproduces information from the DSM 10 and decodes and outputs video with a decoder 25. No mention is made that the encoding apparatus of FIG. 1 is intended to transmit "compressed transmission data" to the decoding apparatus of FIG. 2 via "a single channel," as recited in claim 1.

The Admitted Prior Art and the Kawamura et al. are directed to solving different problems. Kawamura et al. make no mention of solving any problems relating to transmission between an interface unit and a display device; thus, a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not have had an incentive to combine Kawamura et al. and the Admitted Prior Art for a solution to the distance transmission problem.

Fields et al. is related to multiplexing data streams for transmission via a fiber-optic transport link 124. Fields et al. make no mention that any of the data being transmitted by the transport link is directed to a transmission of a graphic image between a graphic signal generation unit and a display device.

The Examiner appears to be using the invention as claimed as a template and selecting portions of the prior art which are useable for implementing the invention based on the template; thus, engaging in impermissible hindsight analysis. It is the references themselves and not the applicants disclosure which must suggest the claimed combination. Further, there must be some motivation to combine the teachings of the references other than the motivation taught by the applicants disclosure.

It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 11 is deemed to be patentable at least for similar reasons set forth above regarding claim 1.

Conclusion:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 1/5/06

By: John H. Stowe

John H. Stowe
Registration No. 32,863

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510